arXiv:quant-ph/9701032v1 24 Jan 1997

Does Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt Correlation or Freedman-Clauser Correlation lead to the largest violation of Bell's Inequality?

M. Ardehali[1]

Research Laboratories, NEC Corporation,
Sagamihara, Kanagawa 229 Japan

Abstract

An inequality is deduced from Einstein's locality and a supplementary assumption. This inequality defines an experiment which can actually be performed with present technology to test local realism. Quantum mechanics violate this inequality a factor of 1.5. In contrast, quantum mechanics violates previous inequalities (for example, Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality of 1969, Freedman-Clauser inequality of 1972, Clauser-Horne inequality of 1974) by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$. Thus the magnitude of violation of the inequality derived in this paper is approximately 20.7% larger than the magnitude of violation of previous inequalities. This result can be particularly important for the experimental test of locality.

[1]email address:ardehali@mel.cl.nec.co.jp

The Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics is based on the fundamental assumption that the wave function, with its statistical interpretation, provides a complete description of physical reality. This assumption has been the object of severe criticism, most notably by Einstein, who always maintained that the wave function should be supplemented with additional "hidden variables" such that these variables together with the wave function precisely determine the results of individual experiments. In 1965, Bell [1] showed that the premises of locality and realism, as postulated by Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) [2], imply some constrains on the statistics of two spatially separated particles. These constrains, which are collectively known as Bell inequalities, are sometime grossly violated by quantum mechanics. Bell's theorem therefore is a proof that all realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics must be non-local.

Bell's original argument, however, can not be experimentally tested because it relies on perfect correlation of the spin of the two particles [3]. Faced with this problem, Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) [4], Freedman-Clauser (FC) [5], and Clauser-Horne (CH) [6] derived correlation inequalities for systems which do not achieve 100% correlation, but which do achieve a necessary minimum correlation. Quantum mechanics violates these inequalities by as much as $\sqrt{2}$ (the factor $\sqrt{2}$ can be achieved only if rotational invariance is assumed, see Eq. $(4')$ of [6]. For a detailed discussion of CHSH, FC and CH inequalities, see the review article by Clauser and Shimony [7], especially inequalities 5.3-5.7). An experiment based on CHSH, or FC, or CH inequality utilizes one-channel polarizers in which the dichotomic choice is between the detection of the photon and its lack of detection. A better experiment is one in which a truly binary choice is made between the ordinary and the

extraordinary rays. In 1971, Bell [8], and later others [9-11], derived correlation inequalities in which two-channel polarizers are used to test locality. Quantum mechanical probabilities violate these inequalities also by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$. In this paper, we derive a correlation inequality for two-channel polarizer systems and we show that quantum mechanics violates this inequality by a factor of 1.5. Thus the magnitude of violation of the inequality derived in this paper is approximately 20.7% larger than the magnitude of violation of previous inequalities of [4-11]. This result can be of considerable importance for the experimental test of local realism.

We start by considering the Bohm's [12] version of EPR experiment in which an unstable source emits pairs of photons in a singlet state $|\Phi\rangle$. The source is viewed by two apparatuses. The first (second) apparatus consists of a polarizer $P_1\,(P_2)$ set at angle $\boldsymbol{a}\,(\boldsymbol{b})$, and two detectors $D_1^{\pm}\left(D_2^{\pm}\right)$ put along the ordinary and the extraordinary beams. During a period of time T, the source emits, say, N pairs of photons. Let $N^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})$ be the number of simultaneous counts from detectors $D_1^{\pm}$ and $D_2^{\pm}$, $N^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a})$ the number of counts from detectors $D_1^{\pm}$, and $N^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b})$ the number of counts from detectors $D_2^{\pm}$. If the time T is sufficiently long, then the ensemble probabilities $p^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) &= \frac{N^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}{N}, \\ p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}) &= \frac{N^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a})}{N}, \\ p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}) &= \frac{N^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b})}{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

We consider a particular pair of photons and specify its state with a parameter λ. Following Bell, we do not impose any restriction on the complexity of λ. "It is a matter of indifference in the following whether λ denotes a single

variable or a set, or even a set of functions, and whether the variables are discrete or continuous." [1]

The ensemble probabilities in Eq. (1) are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) &= \int p\,(\lambda)\,p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\,p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda,\boldsymbol{a}), \\ p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}) &= \int p\,(\lambda)\,p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda), \\ p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}) &= \int p\,(\lambda)\,p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Equations (2) may be stated in physical terms: The ensemble probability for detection of photons by detectors $D_1^{\pm}$ and $D_2^{\pm}$ [that is $p^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})$] is equal to the sum or integral of the probability that the emission is in the state λ [that is $p(\lambda)$], times the conditional probability that if the emission is in the state λ, then a count is triggered by the first detector $D_1^{\pm}$ [that is $p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)$], times the conditional probability that if the emission is in the state λ and if the first polarizer is set along axis a, then a count is triggered from the second detector $D_2^{\pm}$ [that is $p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda,\boldsymbol{a})$]. Similarly the ensemble probability for detection of photons by detector $D_1^{\pm}\left(D_2^{\pm}\right)$ $\left[\right.$ that is $p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a})\,[p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b})]$ $\left.\right]$ is equal to the sum or integral of the probability that the photon is in the state λ [that is $p(\lambda)$], times the conditional probability that if the photon is in the state λ, then a count is triggered by detector $D_1^{\pm}\left(D_2^{\pm}\right)$ $\left[\right.$ that is $p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\,[p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda)]$ $\left.\right]$. Note that Eqs. (1) and (2) are quite general and follow from the standard rules of probability theory. No assumption has yet been made that is not satisfied by quantum mechanics.

Hereafter, we focus our attention only on those theories that satisfy Einstein's criterion of locality, "But on one supposition we should, in my opinion absolutely hold fast: the real factual situation of the system S_2 is independent of what is done with the system S_1, which is spatially separated from

the former" [13]. Einstein's criterion of locality can be translated into the following mathematical equation:

$$p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda, \boldsymbol{a}) = p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda). \tag{3}$$

Equation (3) is the hall mark of local realism. It is the most general form of locality that accounts for correlations subject only to the requirement that a count from the second detector does not depend on the orientation of the first polarizer. The assumption of locality as postulated by Einstein, i.e., Eq. (3), is quite natural since the two photons are spatially separated so that the orientation of the first polarizer should not influence the measurement carried out on the second photon. Now substituting Eq. (3) in Eq. (2), we obtain ensemble probabilities that satisfy Einstein's criterion of locality:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\pm\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) &= \int p(\lambda)\, p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)\, p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda), \\ p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a}) &= \int p(\lambda)\, p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda), \\ p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b}) &= \int p(\lambda)\, p^{\pm}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Before proceeding any further, it is useful to describe the difference between Eq. (3) and CH's criterion of locality. CH write their assumption of locality as

$$p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}, \lambda) = p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a}, \lambda)\, p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b}, \lambda). \tag{5}$$

Apparently by $p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}, \lambda)$, they mean the conditional probability that if the emission is in state λ, then simultaneous counts are triggered by detectors D_1^{+} and D_2^{+}. However, what they call $p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}, \lambda)$ in probability theory is usually written as $p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda)$ [note that $p(x, y, z)$ is the joint probability of x, y and z, whereas $p(x, y \mid z)$ is the conditional probability that if z then x and

y]. Similarly by $p^+(\boldsymbol{a},\lambda)\,[p^+(\boldsymbol{b},\mid\lambda)\,]$, CH mean the conditional probability that if the emission is in state λ, then a count is triggered from the detector $D_1^+\left(D_2^+\right)$. Again what they call $p^+(\boldsymbol{a},\lambda)\,[p^+(\boldsymbol{b},\lambda)\,]$ in probability theory is usually written as $p^+(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\,[p^+(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda)\,]$ (again note that $p(x,z)$ is the joint probability of x and z, whereas $p(x\mid z)$ is the conditional probability that if z then x). Thus according to standard notation of probability theory, CH criterion of locality may be written as

$$p^+(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda)=p^+(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\,p^+(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda)\,. \tag{6}$$

Now according to Bayes' theorem,

$$p^+(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda)=p^+(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\,p^+(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda,\boldsymbol{a})\,. \tag{7}$$

Substituting Eq. (7) in Eq. (6), we obtain

$$p^+(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda,\boldsymbol{a})=p^+(\boldsymbol{b}\mid\lambda)\,, \tag{8}$$

which for the ordinary equation is the same as Eq. (3).

Having clarified the difference between Eq. (3) and CH's criterion of locality, we now show that Eqs. (4) lead to validity of an equality that is sometimes grossly violated by the quantum mechanical predictions in the case of real experiments. First we need to prove the following algebraic theorem.

Theorem: Given ten non-negative real numbers x_1^+, x_1^-, x_2^+, x_2^-, y_1^+, y_1^-, y_2^+, y_2^-, U and V such that $x_1^+,x_1^-,x_2^+,x_2^-\leq U$, and $y_1^+,y_1^-,y_2^+,y_2^-\leq V$, then the following inequality always holds:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= x_1^+y_1^+ + x_1^-y_1^- - x_1^+y_1^- - x_1^-y_1^+ + x_1^+y_2^+ + x_1^-y_2^- \\ &- x_1^+y_2^- - x_1^-y_2^+ + x_2^+y_1^+ + x_2^-y_1^- - x_2^+y_1^- - x_2^-y_1^+ - 2x_2^+y_2^+ \\ &- 2x_2^-y_2^- + Vx_2^+ + Vx_2^- + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Proof: Calling $A = y_1^+ - y_1^-$, we write the function Z as

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= x_2^+\left(-2y_2^+ + A + V\right) + x_2^-\left(-2y_2^- - A + V\right) \\ &+ \left(x_1^+ - x_1^-\right)\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We consider the following eight cases:

(1) First assume

$$\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V \geq 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V \geq 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = 0, x_2^- = 0$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = -U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq -U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= U\left(-A + 2y_2^- + V\right). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Since $V \geq A$ and $y_2^- \geq 0$, $Z \geq 0$.

(2) Next assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V < 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V \geq 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- \geq 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = U, x_2^- = 0$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = -U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(-2y_2^+ + A + V\right) - U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= 2U\left(V + y_2^- - y_2^+\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Since $V \geq y_2^+$, and $y_2^- \geq 0$, $Z \geq 0$.

(3) Next assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V \geq 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V < 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- \geq 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = 0, x_2^- = U$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = -U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(-2y_2^- - A + V\right) - U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= 2U\left(V - A\right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Since $V \geq A$, $Z \geq 0$.

(4) Next assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V \geq 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V \geq 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- < 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = 0, x_2^- = 0$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= U\left(A + 2y_2^+ + V\right). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Since $V \geq A$ and $y_2^+ \geq 0$, $Z \geq 0$.

(5) Next assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V < 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V < 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- \geq 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = U, x_2^- = U$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = -U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(-2y_2^+ + A + V\right) + U\left(-2y_2^- - A + V\right) - U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) \\ &+ Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= U\left(-2y_2^+ - A + 3V\right). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Since $V \geq A$ and $V \geq y_2^+$, $Z \geq 0$.

(6) Next assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V < 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V \geq 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- < 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = U, x_2^- = 0$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(-2y_2^+ + A + V\right) + U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= 2U\left(A + V\right). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Since $V \geq A$, $Z \geq 0$.

(7) Next assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V \geq 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V < 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- < 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = 0, x_2^- = U$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(-2y_2^- - A + V\right) + U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) + Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= 2U\left(y_2^+ - y_2^- + V\right). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Since $V \geq y_2^-$ and $y_2^+ \geq 0$, $Z \geq 0$.

(8) Finally assume $\begin{cases} -2y_2^+ + A + V < 0, \\ -2y_2^- - A + V < 0, \\ A + y_2^+ - y_2^- < 0. \end{cases}$

The function Z is minimized if $x_2^+ = U, x_2^- = U$, and $x_1^+ - x_1^- = U$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\geq U\left(-2y_2^+ + A + V\right) + U\left(-2y_2^- - A + V\right) + U\left(A + y_2^+ - y_2^-\right) \\ &+ Uy_2^+ + Uy_2^- + UV \\ &= U\left(-2y_2^- + A + 3V\right). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Since $V \geq A$ and $V \geq y_2^-$, $Z \geq 0$, and the theorem is proved.

Now let $\boldsymbol{a}$ ($\boldsymbol{b}$) and $\boldsymbol{a'}$ ($\boldsymbol{b'}$) be two arbitrary orientation of the first (second) polarizer, and let

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^\pm &= p^\pm(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda), \qquad x_2^\pm = p^\pm(\boldsymbol{a'}|\lambda), \\ y_1^\pm &= p^\pm(\boldsymbol{b}|\lambda), \qquad y_2^\pm = p^\pm(\boldsymbol{b'}|\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Obviously for each value of λ, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p^\pm(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda) \leq 1, \qquad p^\pm(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda) \leq 1, \\ p^\pm(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) \leq 1, \qquad p^\pm(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) \leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Inequalities (9) and (20) yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
&p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) - p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) \\
&-p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) + p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) \\
&-p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) - p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) + p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) \\
&+p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) - p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) - p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) \\
&-2p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda)p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) - 2p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda)p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) + p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda) \\
&+p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a'} \mid \lambda) + p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) \geq -1. \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}
$$

Multiplying both sides of (21) by $p(\lambda)$, integrating over λ and using Eqs. (4), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + \\
&p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + \\
&p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - 2p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - \\
&2p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{+}(\boldsymbol{a'}) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{a'}) + p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b'}) \geq -1. \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}
$$

All local realistic theories must satisfy inequality (22).

In the atomic cascade experiments, an atom emits two photons in a cascade from state $J = 1$ to $J = 0$. Since the pair of photons have zero angular momentum, they propagate in the form of spherical wave. Thus the probability $p\left(\boldsymbol{d_1}, \boldsymbol{d_2}\right)$ of both photons being simultaneously detected by two detectors in the directions $\boldsymbol{d_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{d_2}$ is

$$
p\left(\boldsymbol{d_1},\ \boldsymbol{d_2}\right) = \eta^2 \left(\frac{\Omega}{4\pi}\right)^2 g\left(\theta, \phi\right), \qquad (23)
$$

where $\cos\theta = \boldsymbol{d_1}.\boldsymbol{d_1}$, η is the quantum efficiency of the detectors, Ω is the solid angle of the detector, and angle ϕ is related to Ω by

$$
\Omega = 2\pi\left(1 - \cos\phi\right). \qquad (24)
$$

Finally the function $g(\theta,\phi)$ is the angular correlation function and in the special cases is given by

$$g(\theta,0)=\frac{3}{4}\left(1+\cos^2\theta\right),$$
$$g(\pi,\phi)=1+\frac{1}{8}\cos^2\phi\,(1+\cos\phi)^2. \tag{25}$$

If we insert polarizers in front of the detectors, then the quantum mechanical predictions for joint detection probabilities are

$$p^+(\boldsymbol{a})=p^-(\boldsymbol{a})=\eta\left(\frac{\Omega}{8\pi}\right),\qquad p^+(\boldsymbol{b})=p^-(\boldsymbol{b})=\eta\left(\frac{\Omega}{8\pi}\right),$$
$$p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\,\boldsymbol{b})=p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\,\boldsymbol{b})=\eta^2\left(\frac{\Omega}{8\pi}\right)^2 g(\theta,\phi)\left[1+F(\theta,\phi)\,cos2\,(\boldsymbol{a}-\boldsymbol{b})\right],$$
$$p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\,\boldsymbol{b})=p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\,\boldsymbol{b})=\eta^2\frac{\Omega}{8\pi}^2 g(\theta,\phi)\left[1-F(\theta,\phi)\cos 2\,(\boldsymbol{a}-\boldsymbol{b})\right]. \tag{26}$$

In experiments which are feasible with present technology [14], because $\Omega\ll 4\pi$, only a very small fraction of photons are detected. Thus inequality (22) can not be used to test the violation of Bell's inequality [15]. We now state a supplementary assumption, and we show that this assumption is sufficient to make these experiments (where $\Omega\ll 4\pi$) applicable as a test of local theories. The supplementary assumption is: For every emission λ, the detection probability by detector D^+ or D^- is *less than or equal* to the sum of detection probabilities by detectors D^+ and D^- when the polarizer is set along any *arbitrary* axis. If we let $\boldsymbol{r}$ be an arbitrary direction of the first polarizer and $\boldsymbol{s}$ be an arbitrary direction of the second polarizer, then the above supplementary assumption may be translated into the following inequalities

$$p^+(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\le p^+(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda)+p^-(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda),\qquad p^-(\boldsymbol{a}\mid\lambda)\le p^+(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda)+p^-(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda),$$
$$p^+(\boldsymbol{a'}\mid\lambda)\le p^+(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda)+p^-(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda),\qquad p^-(\boldsymbol{a'}\mid\lambda)\le p^+(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda)+p^-(\boldsymbol{r}\mid\lambda),$$

$$p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) \leq p^{+}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda), \qquad p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b} \mid \lambda) \leq p^{+}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda),$$
$$p^{+}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) \leq p^{+}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda), \qquad p^{-}(\boldsymbol{b'} \mid \lambda) \leq p^{+}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda) + p^{-}(\boldsymbol{s} \mid \lambda). \tag{27}$$

Now using relations (4), (9), (27), and applying the same argument that led to inequality (22), we obtain the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) \\
&-p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) \\
&-p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - 2p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - 2p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) + p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) \\
&+p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) + p^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) + p^{++}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) + p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) \\
&+p^{--}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) \left[p^{++}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r}) + p^{+-}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r}) + p^{-+}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r}) + p^{--}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r})\right]^{-1} \geq -1.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Note that in the above inequality the the number of emission from the source (something which can not be measured experimentally) is eliminated from the ratio. In fact, in terms of measured detection numbers (something which can be measured experimentally), the above inequality may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&N^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + N^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - N^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - N^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + N^{++}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + N^{--}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) \\
&-N^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - N^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + N^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) + N^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - N^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) \\
&-N^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b}) - 2N^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) - 2N^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'},\ \boldsymbol{b'}) + N^{++}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) + N^{+-}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) \\
&+N^{-+}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) + N^{--}(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{s}) + N^{++}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) + N^{+-}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) + N^{-+}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) \\
&+N^{--}(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{b'}) \left[N^{++}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r}) + N^{+-}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r}) + N^{-+}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r}) + N^{--}(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{r})\right]^{-1} \geq -1.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Inequality (29) contains only double-detection probabilities. Quatum mechanics violates this inequality in case of real experiments where the solid

angle covered by the aperture of the apparatus, Ω, is much less than 4π. In particular the magnitude of violation is maximized if the following set of orientations are chosen: $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) = (\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b'}) = (\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{b}) = 120°$, and $(\boldsymbol{a'}, \boldsymbol{b'}) = 0°$. Using the quantum mechanical probabilities (i.e., Eqs. (26)), inequality (28) [or (29)] becomes $-1.5 \geq -1$, which is certainly impossible.

In summary, we have demonstrated that the conjunction of Einstein's locality [Eq. (3)] with a supplementary assumption [inequality (27)] leads to validity of inequality (29) that is sometimes grossly violated by quantum mechanics. Inequality (29), which may be called weak inequality [3,16,17], defines an experiment which can actually be performed with present technology and which does not require the number of emissions N. Quantum mechanics violates this inequality by a factor of 1.5, whereas it violates the previous inequalities (CHSH inequality of 1969 [4], FC inequality of 1972 [5], CH inequality of 1974 [6], Bell's inequality of 1971 [8], and inequalities of [9-11]) by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$. Thus the magnitude of violation of the inequality derived in this paper is approximately 20.7% larger than the magnitude of violation of the previous inequalities. The larger violation of Bell's inequality can be of considerable importance for the experimental test of locality.

References

[1] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, (1965) 195.

[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 1935) 777.

[3] For an introduction to Bell's theorem and its experimental implications, see F. Selleri, in *Quantum Mechanics Versus Local Realism*, edited by F. Selleri (Plenum Publishing Corporation, 1988).

[4] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, (1969) 880.

[5] S. J. Freedman, and J. F. Clauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 938 (1972).

[6] J. F. Clauser, and M. A. Horne, Phys. Rev. D. **10**, 526 (1974).

[7] J. F. Clauser, and A. Shimony, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41**, (1978) 1881, see especially pp. 1891-1896.

[8] J. S. Bell, in *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, Proceedings of the international School of Physics 'Enrico Fermi,' Course XLIX*, edited by B. d'Espagnat (Academic, New York, 1971).

[9] A. Garuccio, and V. Rapisarda, Nuovo Cim. A. **65**, 269 (1981).

[10] M. Ardehali, Phys. Rev. A **47A**, 1633 (1993).

[11] M. Ardehali, Phys. Rev. A **49R**, 3145 (1994).

[12] D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1951), pp. 614-823.

[13] A. Einstein in *Albert Einstein, Philosopher Scientist* edited by P. A. Schilp, Library of living Philosophers, Evanston, Illinois (1949), p. 85.

[14] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 91 (1982); Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 50 (1988); Z. Y. Ou, X. Y. Zou, L. J. Wang, and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 321 (1990); Y. H. Shih, and C. O. Alley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2921 (1988); J. G. Rarity and P. R. Tapster, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2921 (1990).

[15] It is important to emphasize that a supplementary assumption is required primarily because the solid angle covered by the aperture of the apparatus, Ω, is much less than 4π and not because the efficiency of the detectors, η, is much smaller than 1. In fact in the previous experiments (Ref. 14), $\eta \geq 90\%$. However, because $\Omega \ll 4\pi$, all previous experiments needed supplementary assumptions to test locality

[16] F. Selleri, in *Problems in Quantum Physics; Gdańsk '87*, L. Kostro, A. Posiewnik, J. Pykacz, and M. Zukowski, eds. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988), p. 256.

[17] F. Selleri, in *Microphysical Reality and Quantum Formalism*, edited by A. van der Merwe, F. Selleri, and G. Tarrozi (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1988).